REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed August 2, 2006, Applicants sincerely request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-18 are currently pending in the application, and have also been rejected. Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, and 12-18 have been amended. No new matter is added.

Information Disclosure Statements

Copies of foreign patents and non-patent literature listed in the information disclosure statements submitted on January 23, 2004, November 2, 2005, and April 24, 2006 are being submitted concurrently with this response.

The statement filed on May 4, 2006 was a Statement of Confidentiality provided by the Assignee for filing with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and did not include a US Patent, foreign patent or non-patent documentation. Therefore, no PTO-1449 was filed.

Oath and Declaration

A new Oath and Declaration in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.67(a) has been prepared and signed by three of the inventors. We are in the process of contacting the fourth inventor and hope to submit the revised Oath and Declaration within one week of the filing of this response.

Drawings

Replacement sheets for Figures 2, 3, and 5-9 are submitted along with this response. The specification has also been amended to correct the remaining objections to the drawings as included above.

Specifically:

- Figure 2 has been amended to add "Manifest 38" to the listed elements.
- Reference numeral 110 in Figure 3 has been replaced with reference numeral 112. Accordingly, text associated with Figure 3 has also been amended as submitted above.
- Reference numeral 105 refers to schema library in Figures 1 and 2, and is mentioned throughout the description (e.g. page 5, line 8; page 16, line 30, and so on). Applicants

respectfully submit that 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) does not require each element be repeatedly described in association with each figure. Therefore, the lack of mention of reference numeral 105 in conjunction with Figure 2 does not violate the rules.

- Figures 5 through 9 have been amended to remove reference numerals that are not mentioned in the specification.

- The specification has been amended, as listed above, to include the references to elements 500 and 1120 of Figures 5 and 11, respectively.

Specification

The specification has been amended to address the objections listed in the Office Action for the specification and the drawing. Amendments to the specification are listed beginning on page 2 of this response.

Claim Objections

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, and 12 - 18 have been amended to correct the objected informalities. Amended claims are listed beginning on page 12 of this response.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,480 to Donohue et al. (*Donohue*).

Applicants' amended claim 1 recites a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing updates or additions to application or document functionality, where the method includes, *inter alia*, "attaching a schema to a document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document", "associating a document solution with the document structure, wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions", "determining whether a document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components", "if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising one or more document solutions at a location remote from the document", and "generating the document solution tailored to the profile information associated

with the user of the document." The amendments are supported by the specification (Specification: page 14, lines 15-30). Among other differences, *Donohue* does not anticipate, teach, or suggest the features of amended claim 1.

According to amended claim 1, the schema attached to the document defines permissible data content, data type, and data structure for the document. A document solution associated with a document structure may include an information tip to assist a user of the document and a document action. Furthermore, the method according to claim 1 includes determining whether the document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components. The software components of documents solutions are assembled at a remote location if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components. None of these features of amended claim 1 are disclosed by *Donohue*.

Donohue describes a system and method for delivering documents having dynamic content embedded over the worldwide Internet or a local internet or intranet (*Donohue*: Abstract, col. 3, lines 49-51). According to *Donohue*, document templates are created by embedding dynamic tags and flow directives in markup language documents, the dynamic tags and flow directives containing one or more names of content stored in the data source. The document templates are stored on the server computer. The server computer can receive requests from client computers connected to the Internet, the requests identifying desired documents to be delivered. In response to such a request, the server computer selects one of the document templates corresponding to the desired document, populates the document template with content stored in the data source based on respective values of content corresponding to names in the dynamic tags and flow directives, and delivers the populated document to the client computer (*Donohue*: Abstract, col. 3, line 51 - col. 4, line 4).

Donohue does not disclose or suggest, however, attaching a schema to the document that defines permissible data content, data type, and data structure for the document. Col. 8, lines 25-54 of *Donohue*, referenced by the Office Action simply describe an HTML document template. *Donohue* also does not teach associating a document structure with a document solution that includes an information tip to assist a user of the document or a document action. Moreover, *Donohue* fails to describe, determining whether the document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components and assembling the

software components of documents solutions at a remote location if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components. Fig. 5, element 110 and col. 12, lines 58-60 of *Donohue* describe using a newly constructed physical path to determine whether a template file exists for the browser. This is completely different from the Applicants' recited method of determining whether the document solution is present in a local library of software components and assembling the software components of documents solutions at a remote location if the software components are not present in the local library.

Therefore, *Donohue* does not anticipate, teach, or suggest each and every element of amended claim 1, and the claim is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, and 4 depend from amended independent claim 1 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 2, 3, and 4 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 2, 3, and 4 should also be withdrawn.

Applicants' amended claim 6 recites a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing a desired solution to a computer-generated document, where the method includes, *inter alia*, "determining whether the document references a document solution, wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions", "if the document references a document solution, determining whether the referenced document solution is present in a local library of software components", and "if the plurality of software components is not present in the local library of software components, calling a manifest of document solutions for the document solution." Among other differences, *Donohue* does not anticipate, teach, or suggest the features of amended claim 6 either.

As described above, *Donohue* does not disclose or suggest, a document solution that includes an information tip to assist a user of the document or a document action, or determining whether the referenced document solution is present in a local library of software components. *Donohue* also fails to teach if the plurality of software components is not present in the local library of software components, calling a manifest of document solutions for the document

solution. Thus, the method recited in Applicants' amended claim 6 is also completely different from what is described by *Donohue*.

Therefore, *Donohue* does not anticipate, teach, or suggest each and every element of amended claim 6, and the claim is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from amended independent claim 6 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 7 and 8 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 6. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 7 and 8 should also be withdrawn.

Applicants' amended claim 9 recites a method of managing a document solution downloaded by a software application for use with one or more documents, where the method includes, *inter alia*, "obtaining a document at the software application, wherein a schema is attached to the document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document" and "determining whether the document contains a property identifying the document as being part of a document solution, wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions." Among other differences, *Donohue* does not anticipate, teach, or suggest the features of amended claim 9.

As discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, *Donohue* does not disclose or suggest, a schema attached to the document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document. Furthermore, *Donohue* also fails to teach document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions. Thus, *Donohue* does not anticipate, teach, or suggest each and every element of Applicants' amended claim 9, and the claim is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Applicants' amended claim 12 recites computer-readable medium containing computer executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing updates or additions to application or document functionality, where the method includes, *inter alia*, "attaching a schema to a document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure

for the document", "associating a document solution with the document structure, wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions", "determining whether a document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components", and "if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising one or more document solutions at a location remote from the document."

For at least the same reasons discussed above in conjunction with amended claim 1, *Donohue* fails to disclose or suggest attaching a schema to a document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document, a document solution that includes an information tip to assist a user of the document or a document action, determining whether the document solution associated with the document structure is present in a local library of software components, and if the document solution is not present in the local library of software components, assembling a plurality of software components comprising one or more document solutions at a location remote from the document.

Therefore, *Donohue* also does not anticipate, teach, or suggest each and every element of amended claim 12, and the claim is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 - 16 depend from amended independent claim 12 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 13 - 16 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 12. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 13 - 16 should also be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

<u>Claims 5, 16</u>

Claims 5 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,480 to Donohue et al. (*Donohue*).

Claims 5 and 16 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 12, respectively, with additional features. As discussed above in detail, *Donohue* does not anticipate, teach, or suggest each and every element of claims 1 or 12. Thus, dependent claims 5 and 16 are allowable for at

least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claims 1 and 12. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 5 and 16 should also be withdrawn. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18

Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Donohue* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,742 to Forbes et al. (*Forbes*).

As discussed previously, Donohue fails to teach or suggest features of Applicant's amended claim 6. Claims 7 and 8 depend from independent claim 6 with additional features. Therefore, *Donohue* fails to teach or suggest dependent claims 7 and 8.

Forbes discloses a software package manager that uses a distribution unit containing components for a software package and a manifest file that describes the distribution unit to manage the installation, execution, and uninstallation of software packages on a computer (*Forbes*: Abstract, col. 2, lines 36-52). According to *Forbes*, information in the manifest file pertaining to a software package is stored in a code store data structure upon installation of the package. The manifest file also contains information that permits the software package manager to resolve any software dependencies upon installation. The software package manager uses the code store data structure to locate the required components when the software is executed and to remove the components appropriately when the software is uninstalled (*Forbes*: Abstract, col. 2, lines 36-52).

Forbes does not describe a document solution that includes an information tip to assist a user of the document or a document action, determining whether the referenced document solution is present in a local library of software components, or calling a manifest of document solutions for the document solution if the plurality of software components is not present in the local library of software components as recited in Applicants' amended claim 6.

Thus, *Donohue* and *Forbes* fail to teach or suggest dependent claims 7 or 8 individually or in combination. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Applicants' amended claim 10 recites a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing a desired solution to a computer-generated document, where the method includes, *inter alia*, "obtaining the document, wherein a schema is attached to the document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document", "if the document references a document namespace, determining whether a manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace", and "if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification, wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions." Among other differences, the combination of *Donohue*, and *Forbes* does not teach the features of amended claim 10.

As mentioned previously, *Donohue* fails to describe obtaining a document with a schema attached to the document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document and obtaining a location of a document solution that includes at least one information tip to assist a user of the document or a document action.

Forbes further discloses a package manager updating a code store data structure with information in the manifest file, where the fields in the code store data structure contain such information as the name and version of the distribution unit, a list of the components and their location on the computer, and the source of the distribution unit (*Forbes*: col. 2, lines 55-60), but also fails to disclose obtaining a document with a schema attached to the document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document and obtaining a location of a document solution that includes at least one information tip to assist a user of the document or a document action.

Thus, neither *Donohue* nor *Forbes* teach or suggest elements of amended claim 10. Therefore, amended claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 depends from amended independent claim 10 with additional features. Thus, dependent claim 11 is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to

amended claim 10. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 11 should also be withdrawn.

Applicants' amended claim 17 recites a computer-readable medium containing computer executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform a method of downloading software components from a remote source to a software application for providing a desired solution to a computer-generated document, where the method includes, *inter alia*, "obtaining the document, wherein a schema is attached to the document defining permissible data content, data type and data structure for the document", " if the document references a document namespace, determining whether a manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace", and "if the manifest collection contains a document solution identification associated with the document namespace, obtaining a location of the document solution identified by the document solution identification, wherein the document solution includes at least one from a set of a plurality of information tips to assist a user of the document and a plurality of document actions." Among other differences, the combination of *Donohue*, and *Forbes* also does not teach the features of amended claim 18.

As discussed above in conjunction with claim 10, *Donohue* and *Forbes* fail to teach or suggest elements of amended claim 17, individually or in combination. Therefore, amended claim 17 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 depends from amended independent claim 17 with additional features. Thus, dependent claim 18 is allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 17. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claim 18 should also be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

A request for a three-month extension of time is requested for the period of November 2, 2006 through February 2, 2007 and is submitted with this amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

Date: February 2, 2007

_____
Carl K. Turk
Reg. No. 59,675

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: (404) 954.5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE